

What follows is a re-translation from the Spanish translation of the article, **Decolonization is not a Metaphor**” by Tuck and Yang...the Spanish language translation was published in the Colombian journal, *Tabla Rasa*. Retranslated into English via Google Translate. [Note: footnotes are highlighted in yellow; tables highlighted in aqua]. Spanish translation at <http://www.scielo.org.co/pdf/tara/n38/1794-2489-tara-38-61.pdf>

Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W (2012) Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, 1 (1) 1-40.

Abstract

Our goal in this article is to remind readers of the unsettling nature of decolonization. Decolonization brings with it the repatriation of the land and the indigenous life; is not a metaphor for other things we want to do to improve our societies. The easy adoption of the decolonizing discourse evidenced by the growing number of calls to "decolonize our schools," or use "methods decolonizers" or "decolonize thought," turns decolonization into a metaphor. However important their goals, social justice, critical methodologies or Approaches that decentralize colonizer perspectives have goals that they may be incommensurable with decolonization. Because colonialism of settlement is built on a tangled triad structure of native settler-slave, the decolonial desires of white people, non-white people, immigrants, post-colonial and oppressed may similarly become entangled in resettlement, reoccupation and reintegration that actually foster settler colonialism.

The metaphorization of decolonization makes possible a series of escapes, or "moves settlers to innocence", which problematically attempt to reconcile guilt and the complicity of the settlers, and rescue the future of the settlers. In this article, we analyze multiple settler moves toward innocence in order to promote "an ethics of incommensurability" that recognizes what is different and what is sovereign for decolonization projects in relation to social justice projects based on human and civil rights. We also point out disturbing issues within transnational/Third World decolonizations, abolition, and critical pedagogies of space-place, which challenge the coalescence of the efforts of social justice, leading to more meaningful potential alliances.

Keywords: decolonization; settler colonialism, moves of settlers to innocence, incommensurability, Indigenous land, decolonizing thought.

Decolonization is not a metaphor

Summary:

This article aims to remind readers how distressing decolonization is. Decolonization brings with it the repatriation of Indigenous life and land. It is not a metaphor of other things we want to do to advance our societies. An easy adoption of the decolonizing discourse –which is made evident in the increasing number of calls to «decolonizing our schools», using “decolonizing methods” or “decolonizing thinking”– turns decolonization into a metaphor. No matter how significant its goals, social justice, critical methodologies, or approaches, decentralizing the settler's perspective has a set of goals that may be incommensurable with decolonization. Since settler colonialism is built upon a tangled triadic settler-native-slave structure, white, non-white, migrant, post-colonial, and oppressed people's decolonial desires may get similarly entangled throughout resettlement, re-occupation, and reinsertion, which are indeed promoting settler's colonialism. turning decolonization into a metaphor allows for a series of evasions, or “settlers’ moves to innocence”, which problematically attempt to reconcile settler's guilt and complicity, thus rescuing settler's futurity. This article analyzes varied settlers' moves to innocence in order to foster “an ethics of incommensurability”, acknowledging what is different and sovereign for decolonization projects as related to social justice projects based on human and citizen's rights. Also, we point out some concerning issues in transnational/ Third World decolonization, abolition, and critical space-place pedagogies, challenging coalescing efforts for social justice, giving room to potential more significant alliances.

Keywords: decolonization, settler's colonialism, settler's moves to innocence, incommensurability, Indigenous land, decolonizing thinking.

Decolonization, which aims to change the order of the world, is, as you can see, a program of disorder absolute. But it cannot be the result of an operation magic, of a natural jolt or of an understanding friendly. Decolonization is, as is known, a process historical: that is to say, that it cannot be understood, that it is not intelligible, translucent in itself, but in the exact extent to which movement is discerned historicizing that gives it form and content.

Frantz Fanon, The Wretched of the Earth, 1963, p. 36

Let's admit it, the colonizer knows perfectly well that no phraseology replaces reality.

Frantz Fanon, The Wretched of the Earth, 1963, p. Four. Five

Introduction

Over the last few years, our writings and our teaching practice have

been dedicated to drawing attention to how settler colonialism has shaped education and educational research in the United States United States and other nation-states colonial settlement. These are two tasks different, but that coincide in part, where the first has to do with the how the dynamics of settler colonialism marks the organization, governance, curricula and evaluation of compulsory education, and the another has to do with the way in which the perspectives and vision of the world of the settler come to be considered knowledge and research, and how those perspectives – reformulated as data and findings – are activated in order to rationalize and maintain unjust social structures. We do this work together with many others who, in a certain way relentlessly, in writings, congresses, courses and activism, do not allow the real and symbolic violence of the settler colonialism.

Parallel to this work, we have been thinking about what it means, what it wants and what it needs decolonization. A trend that we have observed, with more and more apprehension, is the ease with which language has been superficially adopted of decolonization in education and other social sciences, supplanting forms previous conversations about social justice, critical methodologies or approaches that they decentralize the prospects of the colonizer. Decolonization, which we affirm is a project distinct from other rights-based social justice projects human and civilian, is too often subservient to the directives of these projects, regardless of how decolonization wants something different from those forms of justice. Settler scholars exchange former terms of human and civil rights, apparently to signal both an awareness of the importance of Indigenous and decolonizing theories about education and research in education and in other areas and disciplines of the social sciences and the humanities, so as to include Indigenous peoples in the list of considerations, such as one more special (ethnic) group or class. at a conference on educational research, it is not uncommon to hear speakers refer, almost with indifference, to the need to "decolonize our schools" or use "methods decolonizing" or "decolonizing student thinking". Still, we've observed that an alarming number of these discussions do not mention the peoples

Indigenous, our/their5 struggles for the recognition of our/their sovereignty or the contributions of intellectuals and Indigenous activists to theories and frameworks decolonization theorists. Also, lack of recognition is very common given to the immediate context of the colonialism of settlement in North American territories, where many of these conferences.

Of course, dressing up in the language of decolonization is not so offensive as the underwear "with Navajo prints" sold in a chain of clothing stores (Gaynor, 2012) and other appropriations of cultures and Indigenous materials that occur so frequently. But this kind of inclusion is a kind of enclosure, dangerous because of the way it tames the decolonization. It is also an embargo, limiting the way you recapitulate dominant theories of social change. On the occasion of the inaugural edition of Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education, & Society, we wanted to make sure clarify that decolonization is not a metaphor. When the metaphor invades decolonization kills the very possibility of decolonization; bring back whiteness at the center, refounds theory, extends innocence to the colonizer, contemplates a future of settlers. It is not easy to graft decolonize (the verb) and decolonization (the noun) in pre-existing discourses and theoretical frameworks, even when they are critical, even when they are anti-racist, even when they are frames of Justice. The easy absorption, adoption and transposition of decolonization is only another form of colonial appropriation. When we write about decolonization, we are not presenting it as a metaphor; is not an approximation of others experiences of oppression. Decolonization is not an interchangeable term for other things we want to do for the advancement of our societies and educational institutions. Decolonization has no synonym.

Our purpose with this essay is to remind our readers how unsettling of decolonization, what is disturbing and what should be. Is clear that we advocate the analysis of settler colonialism within the education, educational research and social science research,

and we place the work of Indigenous thinkers as something central in the liberation from the puzzling aspects of public education. We, at least in part, we want others to join in these efforts to stop make invisible the colonial structuring of settlement and the indigenous criticism of that structuring. However, this accession cannot be too simple, too open, too adapted. Solidarity is an uncomfortable affair, secretive and dissatisfied that neither reconciles current grievances nor undoes conflict future. There are parts of the decolonization project that are not easily assimilated by human rights or civil rights approaches to educational equity. In this essay, we think about what decolonization wants.

There is a long and hesitant history of moves by non-Indigenous peoples to mitigate the impacts of colonization. The too light adoption of the speech decolonizing (which turns decolonization into a metaphor) is just one part of the story and taps into pre-existing tropes that get in the way of possible more significant alliances. We thought about the representation of those tropes as a series of moves toward innocence (Malwhinney, 1998), which attempts to problematic way to reconcile the settler's guilt and complicity, and rescue his future of him. Here, to explain why decolonization is more than a metaphor and needs more than that, we discuss some of those moves towards innocence:

Yo. settler nativism

ii. adoption fantasies

iii. colonial mistake

IV. awareness

v. Mark "at risk" / Star Indigenous Peoples

saw. Reoccupation and urban colonization

These moves ultimately represent the settler's fantasies of finding ways simpler to reconciliation. Actually, we hold that dealing with what what is irreconcilable in settler colonial relations and what is incommensurable between decolonization projects and other justice projects social will contribute to reducing the frustration of attempts at solidarity; but the Attention will spare no one from the arduous and unsettling work of decolonization.

Thus, we also include a discussion about the interruptions that disturb the innocence and acknowledge incommensurability.

The Set of Colonial Settlement Relations

In general terms, postcolonial theories and theories of coloniality are engaged in two forms of colonialism.⁶ External colonialism (also called exogenous or colonization of the exploitation) denotes the expropriation of fragments of Indigenous worlds, animals, plants and humans, extracting them for transport them to the settlers, and create wealth, privilege, or satisfy the appetites of the colonizers, who are cataloged as the first world.

This includes examples considered "historic", such as opium, spices, tea, sugar and tobacco, whose extraction continues to fuel colonial initiatives. This way of Colonialism also includes feeding current appetites for diamonds, fish, water, oil, labor exploitation, genetic material, cadmium and other minerals essential for advanced technology devices. External colonialism many sometimes requires a subset of activities appropriately called colonialism military – the creation of war fronts and frontiers against enemies to be conquered, and the recruitment of foreign land, resources and people for military operations.

In external colonialism, everything Native is reframed as "natural resources" –bodies and the earth for war, bodies and the planet as property.

The other form of colonialism with which postcolonial theories and theories of coloniality is internal colonialism, biopolitical management and geopolitics of people, land, flora and fauna, within borders

"nationals" of the imperial nation. This involves the use of control modes particularized: prisons, ghettos, minoritisation, education, police surveillance, to ensure the dominance of a country and its white elite.⁷ These modes of

[6 Colonialism is not just a symptom of capitalism. The socialist and communist empires have been also settler colonial empires (eg Chinese colonialism in Tibet). "In others words," Sandy Grande writes, "both Marxists and capitalists consider land and resources natural resources as raw materials for exploitation, first of all, by capitalists for their profit personal, and, secondly, by Marxists for the common good" (2004, p. 27). capitalism and the state are technologies of colonialism, developed over time to promote projects colonial. Racism is an invention of colonialism (Silva, 2007). The current colonial era dates back

to 1492, when the colonial imaginary becomes global.

7

By using terms like "white" and "whiteness," we acknowledge that whiteness extends beyond of the phenotype.]

control, detention and involuntary transportation of human beings across borders –ghettos, their police, their economic disinvestment and their dislocation– are functioning to authorize the metropolis and limit its periphery. The strategies of internal colonialism, such as segregation, deprivation, surveillance and criminalization, They are both structural and interpersonal.

Our intention in this descriptive exercise is not to be exhaustive or even irrefutable; rather, we want to emphasize that a) decolonization will take a different form in each of these contexts, though it may coincide in parts⁸, and that b) neither internal nor external colonialism describe the form of colonialism that operates in the United States or in the nation-states in those that the colonizer comes to stay. Settler colonialism operates through internal/external colonial modes simultaneously because there is no spatial separation between metropolis and colony. For example, in the United States, many Indigenous peoples have been forcibly removed from their territories ancestral and taken to reservations, subjected to unpaid work and kidnapped to put them under state custody, pointing out the form of colonization as both internal (through boarding schools and other modes of biopolitical control) and external (through the exploitation of uranium in indigenous territories of the southwest of the United States and oil extraction on Indigenous lands in Alaska) with a border (the US military continues to nickname any territory enemy as «Indigenous country»). The horizons of the colonial nation-state of settlements are total and demand a mode of total appropriation of the Indigenous life and land, instead of the selective expropriation of fragments profit producers.

Settler colonialism is different from other forms of colonialism in which settlers arrive with the intention of building a new home in the territory, a construction of home that insists on the sovereignty of the settler over all things in his new domain. Therefore, relying solely on

postcolonial literatures or in theories of coloniality that ignore the settler colonialism will not help conceive of the form it should take decolonization in colonial settlement colonial contexts. In the settler colonialism, the most important concern is the land, the water, air, subterranean resources (the earth, to put it succinctly in this article). The land is the most valuable, disputed, required. This is due already that settlers make Indigenous land their new home and source of capital, and also because the interruption of Indigenous relations with the land represents a deep epistemic, ontological and cosmological violence. said violence

8 We do not treat internal/external as a taxonomy of colonialisms. They describe two ways colonialist operations. These modes can coincide, reinforce and contradict each other, and do so by through particular legal, social, economic, and political processes that are context-specific.

is not temporarily held back by the settler's arrival, but reasserts itself each day of occupation. This is why Patrick Wolfe (1999) emphasizes that settler colonialism is a structure and not an episode. In the process of settler colonialism, the land becomes property and human relations with that land are limited to the relationship of the owner with his owned by him. Epistemological, ontological and cosmological relationships are buried with the earth, in effect made pre-modern and retrograde. Wild. In order for settlers to make a home out of a place, they must destroy and disappear the indigenous peoples who live there. Indigenous peoples are those who have creation stories, not colonization stories, about how we/they we arrived/came to be in a specific place– indeed we/they arrived/ they became a place. Our/their relations with the land comprise our/ their epistemologies, ontologies and cosmologies. For the settler, the Indigenous peoples stand in the way and, in the destruction of the Indigenous peoples, the communities Indigenous, and over time and through law and policy, the claims of the Indigenous peoples on the land, the land under settler regimes, become to mold as property and as a resource. Indigenous peoples must be erased, they must become ghosts (Tuck & Ree, 2013). At the same time, settler colonialism involves the subjugation

of the forced labor of captive slaves,⁹

whose bodies and lives

become property and remain landless. Slavery

in colonial settlement contexts is distinct from other forms of servitude

by contract, through which excess work is extracted from people. In

In the first place, captives are labor commodities and therefore it is

the person of the slave who is the excess. Second, contrary to the

workers, who can aspire to their own land, the very presence of the slave in

the earth is already an excess that must be dislocated. Thus, the slave is a

desirable commodity, but the person behind it is apprehendable, punishable,

killable. The violence of keeping or murdering the captive slave makes them

monsters that seem dead in the colonist's imagination; are reconfigured and

they disfigure like the threat, the razor edge of security and terror.

The settler, if he knows himself by his actions and the way he justifies them, sees himself

as possessor of dominion over the earth and its flora and fauna, as normal

anthropocentric, and as more developed, more humane, more deserving than

9 As Erica Neeganagwedgin (2012) noted, these two groups are not always distinct.

Neeganagwedgin presents a history of the subjugation of Indigenous peoples in Canada as

slaves. In California, Mexico, and the American Southwest within the Spanish mission system,

Indigenous peoples were driven from their land and also turned into slaves. under colonization

American, California law established that Indians could be killed or

subjected to unpaid labor by any "person" (white, property-owning, citizen). Those laws are

remained in force until 1937

other groups or species. The settler is building a new "home," but that

home is rooted in a worldview of colonizing wastelands, where

the wild land and uncivilized people are there for your benefit. can only

build his identity as a settler by making the land produce, and produce in

excess, because "civilization" is defined as excess production of the world

"natural" (that is, in excess of the sustainable production already present in the world

Indigenous). For there to be excess production, he needs labor, which is not

can provide for itself. The captive slave serves as that excessive labor, a

work that he can never pay himself, because payment would have to be in the form of

property (land). The settler's wealth is land, or a redeemable version of her, and that is why it is impossible to pay for the work.¹⁰ The settler is positioned as superior and at the same time normal; the settler is natural, while the Indigenous inhabitant and the captive slave are unnatural, even supernatural.

The settlers are not immigrants. Immigrants are subject to the laws and Indigenous epistemologies of the lands to which they migrate. The settlers become in law, supplanting Indigenous laws and epistemologies. Therefore, the colonizing nations are not immigrant nations (see also Barker, 2009).

Like many others, the United States, as a colonial nation-state of settlement, also operates as an empire, using external and internal forms of colonization simultaneous to the project

colonial settlement. this wants

say, and it is disconcerting to some,

that dispossessed people are taken

to the embargoed Indigenous lands through other colonial projects. Those

other colonial projects include slavery, as discussed, but also

military recruitment, manpower recruitment with ups and downs

wages (such as farm workers and foreign-trained engineers),

and displacement and migration (such as coerced immigration from countries

in ruins by US wars or devastated by economic policy

American). In this set of settler colonial relations,

colonial subjects displaced by external colonialism, racialized

and minorized by internal colonialism, continue to occupy and colonize

stolen indigenous land. The settlers are diverse, not just of white descent

European, and include people of color, even from other colonial contexts. East

closely entangled set of conditions and racialized relations and

globalized exponentially complicates what is meant by decolonization,

and out of solidarity, against the settler colonial forces.

Decolonization in exploitative colonial situations may involve

the seizure of imperial wealth by the postcolonial subject. In

colonial settlement situations, the confiscation of imperial wealth is

inextricably linked to colonization and reinvasion. Similarly,

the promise of integration and civil rights is preached to ensure a slice of a wealth appropriated by the settlers (as well as a wealth of the "third world" expropriated). Decolonization in a settler context is forge because the empire, colonization and internal colony have no separation space. Each of these features of settler colonialism in the context -empire, settlement and internal colony- make this a place contradiction of decolonial desires.¹¹

Decolonization as a metaphor allows people to use ambiguous these contradictory decolonial desires, because it turns the decolonization into an empty signifier that can be filled by any path to liberation. In reality, the tracks go through all the land/people in settler contexts. Although the details are not fixed or agreed upon, In our opinion, decolonization in the colonial context of settlement must involve the repatriation of the land simultaneously with the recognition of how the land and relations with the land have always been understood and implemented in different ways, that is, the whole earth, and not just symbolic. That is precisely why decolonization is necessarily conflictive, especially along the lines of solidarity. "Decolonization it never goes unnoticed" (Fanon, 1963, p. 36). settler colonialism, and its decolonization involves and worries everyone.

Playing Indian and the suppression of Indigenous peoples

Recently, at a symposium on the importance of the Liberal Arts in education in the United States, Eve made an argument that the Liberal arts education has historically excluded any attention toward settler colonialism or any analysis of it. This, she claimed Eve makes Liberal Arts education complicit in the project of the settler colonialism and, even more, that it has made the project more legitimate part of Liberal Arts education something like trying to make the settler look as native to the land he occupies. The interest of the attendees was aroused with this idea, with nods and murmurs of approval, and it was then that Eve realized that she was trying to say something immeasurable with what what they expected her to say. She was completely misunderstood. A lots of

11 Decolonization is made even more difficult because, although the settler-native-slave triad structures the settler colonialism, that does not mean that the colonist, the native and the slave are analogous that can be used to describe corresponding identities, structural locations, views of the world and ways of behaving. Nor do they constitute each other. For example, the indigenous is an identity independent of the triad, and also an attributed structural location within the triad. Slave is an attributed structural position, but not an identity. Colonius describes a series of behaviors, in addition to a structural position, but it is avoided as an identity.

in the audience heard this observation: that the work of arts education Liberals is partly to teach the settlers to be Indigenous, as something admirable, worthwhile, something healthy, not as problematic evidence about the scope of the colonial suppression of the settlements.

Philip Deloria (1998) explores how and why the settler wants to become indigenized, even when he is only in a costume, and other ways of playing the Indians. Play to the Indians is a powerful American pastime, from the Boston Tea Party, to fraternities, New Age trends, even to clothing interior with native print mentioned above. Deloria maintains that, "From the colonial period to the present, the Indigenous have roamed within and outside of the most important stories that various Americans have told of themselves» (p. 5).

The indeterminacy of American identities emerges, in part, from the inability as a country to deal with the Indigenous. The Americans feel a natural affinity with the continent, and were the Indigenous who taught them that aboriginal proximity. But for control the landscape they had to destroy the original inhabitants. (Deloria, 1998, p. 5)

L. Frank Baum (author of The Wizard of Oz) famously stated in 1890 that the safety of the white settlers was only guaranteed with the "annihilation of the few remaining Indigenous people" (as quoted by Hastings, 2007). D.H. Lawrence, reading James Fenimore Cooper (discussed in more detail later later in this article), Nathaniel Hawthorne, Hector St. John de Crevecoeur, Henry David Thoreau, Herman Melville, Walt Whitman and others for their Studies of American classic literature (Studies in Classic American Literature, 1924),

describes Americans' fascination with indigenism as a ambivalent feeling of desire and repulsion (Deloria, 1998).

"No place," Lawrence asserted, "exerts full influence over a newly reached until the former inhabitant is dead or is absorbed". Lawrence argued that to meet the "demon of the continent" head-on and that this would end the "unexpressed spirit of America," Americans Whites had to either destroy the Indians or assimilate them into a world white American...both in order to make the Indians vanish from the landscape. (Lawrence, cited in Deloria, 1998, p. 4)

Everything within a settler colonial society strives to destroy or assimilate the Native to make them disappear from the earth; this is how a society can have multiple conflicting messages at once about Indigenous peoples, like all the Indians are dead, located on distant reservations, that the contemporary Indigenous peoples are less Indigenous than generations above, that all Americans are a "little bit Indian." These wishes of to suppress, to let time do its thing and hope that the old way of life dies, to even speed things up (apply euthanasia), because it is thought that the death of pre-modern life forms is inevitable; these are all wishes of another type of resolution of the colonial situation, which is resolved through the total and utter destruction or assimilation of the original inhabitants.

Numerous academics have observed that indigenism provokes multiple forms of settler anxiety, even if only because the presence of the Indigenous peoples – who make demands for land and ways of being a priori – is a constant reminiscence that the colonial project of the settlements is incomplete (Fanon, 1963; Vine Deloria, 1988; Grande, 2004; Bruyneel, 2007). The easy adoption of decolonization as a metaphor (and nothing more) is a manifestation of said anxiety, because it is an attempt to reconcile premature. The absorption of decolonization by justice frameworks settler social is a way in which the settler, disturbed by his very settler status, try to escape or contain the unbearable searchlight of complicity, of having harmed others just for being oneself. the desire of reconciliation is hardly as implacable as the desire to disappear the Native;

it is a desire not to have to deal with this problem anymore (Indigenous).

Settler moves towards innocence

We note that another component of a desire to play Indian is a desire of the settler to become innocent, to find some leniency or relief from the inexorability of the settler's guilt and burden (see Tuck & Ree, 2013, about indulgence and overwhelm). Your direct and indirect benefit from deletion and assimilation of the Indigenous peoples is a reality that is difficult for the colonists. The weight of this reality is uncomfortable; the misery of guilt makes them run towards any temporary relief. In her 1998 master's thesis, Janet Mawhinney analyzed the ways in which whites maintained and (re)produced privilege white in contexts and organizations self-defined as anti-racist.¹² she analyzed the role of storytelling and self-confession, which serves to equate stories of personal exclusion with stories of structural racism and exclusion, and what she calls "steps to innocence" or "strategies to suppress participation and guilt by systems of domination" (p. 17). Mawhinney is based on the concept of Mary Louise Fellows and Sherene Razack (1998), of «the race for innocence», «the process by which a woman comes to believe that her own claim to subordination is the most urgent, and that she she is not involved in the subordination of other women" (p. 335). Mawhinney's thesis theorizes the position that white people take as simultaneously the oppressed and never an oppressor, and as possessors of an absence experience of oppressive power relations (p. 100). This self-positioning simultaneously allowed whites in various purportedly anti-racist contexts say to people of color, "I don't deal with the problems that you have, so so, I don't think about it", and "tell me what to do; you are the experts here" (p. 103). "The appeal to common sense of these claims," observes Mawhinney, allows white speakers to "pronounce them optimistically in [their] appearance of equanimity, is rooted in the normalization of a liberal analysis of power relations» (1998, p.103).

In the discussion that follows, we will make an effort to identify and refute a series of what we call "settler moves to innocence." The moves of settlers towards innocence are those strategies or positions that try to attenuate feelings of guilt or responsibility in the settler without giving up

land or power or privilege, without needing to change much overall. Of In fact, colonist scholars may receive professional accolades or a boost to your reputation for sensitivity or conscientiousness. But the moves of settlers towards innocence are empty, they only serve the settler. This discussion surely will cause discomfort in our colonist readers, it can produce -us/-them embarrassment or make -us/- them feel responsible. Due to the racialized flow of colonial empire of the settlements described above, the settlers are miscellaneous; there are white and brown settlers, and people in both groups make moved towards innocence that seek to deny and evade their complicity in the settler colonialism. When it makes sense to do so, we pay attention to moves toward innocence that manifest differently among white and brown people and so on.

With the description of the settlers' moves towards innocence, our goal it is to provide a framework of excuses, distractions and diversions from decolonization. We take a closer look at some of the moves toward innocence above others, mostly because some require less explanation and because others are more central to our initial argument by demetaphorizing decolonization. We offer this framework so that we can be more impatient with the other, less willing to accept lukewarm gestures and measures, and more willing to press for acts that destabilize innocence, which we will discuss in the final part of this article.

Moves Towards Innocence I: Settler Nativism

In this move toward innocence, the settlers identify or invent an ancestor lost in time who is rumored to have had "Indigenous blood", and use Natives. There are numerous examples of public figures in the United States who "remember" a remote Indigenous ancestor, such as Nancy Reagan (who is said to that she was a descendant of Pocahontas) and more recently, Elizabeth Warren, 13 and many others, illustrating the commonality of settler nativism. came deloria Jr. discusses what he calls the Indigenous grandmother complex in the following account from Custer Died for Your Sins:

Throughout my three years as executive director of the National Congress of American Indians it was rare for a day to go by without some white

[person] visited my office and proudly proclaimed that he had indigenous ancestry...

I sometimes got defensive about being Sioux when these people whites had a much more respectable pedigree than mine. But with the over time I came to understand their need to identify as Indigenous in part and I did not resent them. I confirmed their craziest stories about his Indigenous ancestry and added some stories of my production Hoping that one day they would be able to accept each other and leave us alone.

Whites who claimed to have Indian blood generally tend to reinforce mythical beliefs about the Indigenous. everyone i met with exception of one of those who claimed to have indigenous blood, they said it was because of the side of a grandmother of his. I once did a retrospective projection and I discovered that evidently most of the tribes were completely women during the first three centuries of white occupation. Nobody, at Apparently, he wanted to claim an Indigenous man as an ancestor. It doesn't take much to understand racial attitudes to understand the real meaning of the Indigenous grandmother complex suffered by certain whites. A male ancestor has too much wild warrior aura, instinctive animal to become a respectable member of the tree genealogical. But a young Indigenous princess? Ah, there was royalty from which lay hands Somehow white was linked to a noble cause of gentility and culture if his grandmother was an Indigenous princess who eloped with a fearless pioneer...

Although a real Indigenous grandmother is probably the nicest thing can happen to a child, why is a remote grandmother so necessary of Indigenous royalty for so many whites? Is it because she scares them

13 See Francie Latour interview (June 1, 2012) with Kim Tallbear for more information on the example of Elizabeth Warren. In the interview, Tallbear states that the claims romanticized and Warren's accusations of fraud are evidence of the ways in which people in America misunderstands Native American identity. Tallbear insists that in order to understand Native American identity, "must break out of that binary framework, of a drop." said claim to exculpate himself from the attempts to eradicate the peoples

be classified as foreigners? Do they need any blood relationship with the border and its dangers to experience what it is like to be American? EITHER Is it an attempt to avoid facing the guilt they have for the treatment of the Natives? (1988, pp. 2-4)

Settler nativism, or what Vine Deloria Jr. calls the complex of Indigenous grandmother, is a move of the settlers towards innocence, because it is an attempt to siphon off a settler's identity, while he continues to enjoy settler privileges and occupying stolen land. Deloria notes that the settler nativism is gendered and considers the reasons why that the story of an Indigenous grandmother may have more appeal than that of a indigenous grandfather. On one level, many settlers are expected to have a Indigenous ancestor or was a slave. That is precisely the custom of settler colonialism, pushing humans into other communities human rights, strategies of rape and sexual violence, but also the attraction of ordinary human relations, guarantee that the settlers have ancestors Indians and slaves.

Furthermore, although race is a social construct, Indigenous peoples and slaves, especially those brought from the African continent, were and are racialized differently in ways that support and supported the logics and objectives of the settler colonialism (the suppression of the Indigenous person and the capture and confinement of the Slavs). «In the United States, Indigenous Peoples have been racialized and opposite ways that reflect their antiethical roles in shaping society American," explains Patrick Wolfe (2006):

The subjugation of blacks produced an inclusive taxonomy that automatically enslaved the offspring of one slave and another progenitor. After slavery, this taxonomy became completely racialized in the "one-drop rule," whereby any degree of descent African, no matter how remote and despite the phenotypic appearance turns a person black. (p.387)

Kim Tallbear argues that the one-drop norm dominates notions of race in United States and therefore most people in this country have not been able to understand Indigenous identity (Latour, 2012). By the one drop rule, the

Blackness in settler colonial contexts is expansive, ensuring that slave/criminal status will be inherited by an expanding number of "black" descendants. But Indigenous peoples have been racialized profoundly different way. Native American¹⁴ is subtractive: a 14 Native American, then, may be a signifier of how Indigenous peoples (more than 500 federally recognized tribes and nations only in the United States) were racialized into one race disappearing in the colonial context of American settlement Native Americans are constructed to be fewer in number and less native, but never precisely white, at the time. our/your condition as Indigenous peoples and first settlers is the basis of our/their land claims and the goal of settler colonialism is to extinguish land claims between generations (or sooner, if possible). That is, Native American is a racialization that describes current Indigenous generations as less authentic, less Indigenous than previous generations to end up phasing out the Indigenous land claims and make way for settler claims for the property. This is basically done through registries and policies of quantity of blood, which were imposed on the nations and communities Indigenous peoples and, in some cases, have overshadowed earlier forms of determination of tribal membership.

Wolfe (2006) continues:

For the Indigenous, in stark contrast, the non-Indigenous ancestor put their indigenism at risk, producing "mestizos", a regime which is maintained in the form of blood quantity regulations. In opposition to slaves, whose reproduction increased the wealth of their owners, the Indigenous, obstructed access to the land, so that its increase was counterproductive. In this way, the restrictive racial classification of the Indians directly promoted the logic of the elimination. (p.387)

The Racializations of Indigenous Peoples and Blacks in the Colonial Nation-State of settlement of the United States are aimed at the predominance of settlers whites as the legitimate and true owners and occupants of the land.

In the national mythologies of those societies, whites are believed to have come first and that it was they who primarily developed the Earth; Aboriginal peoples are supposed to have been mostly dead or assimilated. Thus, the European settlers became the inhabitants of the originals and in the group with greater rights to the fruits of citizenship. (Razack, 2002, pp. 1-2; emphasis in original)

In the racialization of whiteness, the norms of blood quantum are inverted so that white people can remain white, but still claim the offspring of an indigenous grandmother. In 1924, the Virginia legislature passed the Racial Integrity Act, enforcing the one-drop rule except for whites who claimed to have a distant Indigenous grandmother, such as a result of intense pressure from the aristocratic "first families of Virginia" who all claim descent from Pocahontas (including Nancy Reagan, born in 1921). Known as the Pocahontas exception, this loophole allowed thousands of whites to claim Indian ancestry, while actual Indians were reclassified as "colored" and struck from the public record.¹⁵

The nativism of settlers, by claiming the ancestor lost in the time, invests in these specific racializations of Indigenous and Black people and puts in question the sovereign authority of Indigenous nations to determine parentage within the tribal. Dakota scholar Kim Tallbear (in an interview about the recent example of Elizabeth Warren), offers a story that repeats and updates the story of Deloria. Speaking of the many versions of settler nativism that she has found, where people say,

"My great-great-grandmother was an Indigenous princess" [or] "I am descended from Pocahontas". What Elizabeth Warren said about high cheekbones.

She has touched me to see so many people from all over the political spectrum say things as rare and more. And what I think is, maybe you have some ancestor remote. And that? you don't just walk in and decide it's Cherokee if the community does not recognize it as such. (As cited in Latour, 2012).

Ancestry is distinct from tribal affiliation; Indigenous identity and tribal affiliation. These are issues that only Indigenous communities have the right to contend with, and define, not DNA testing, genealogy websites, and certainly not the

settler state. Settler nativism is all about imagining the past Indigenous and the future settler; in contrast, tribal sovereignty has made it possible an Indigenous present and several Indigenous intellectuals propose decolonization as future natives without a settler state.

Moved to Innocence II: Settler Adoption Fantasies

In the description of acts of death, Sara Ahmed (2000) affirms the importance of being able to replace the 'foreigner', or take the place of the another, in the consolidation and (re)affirmation of white identity. "Convert without becoming" is to reproduce "the other as "negation of me" within not beyond of the structure of the "I"» (p. 132). Sherene Razack, reading Ahmed, tells us that the appropriation of the other's pain occurs when, "we think we are recognizing not only the pain of the other or the other, but their difference. The difference becomes the identification conduit in much the same way as does the pain" (Razack, 2007, p. 379). Discussing the movie *Dances with Wolves* (film fiction of a Union soldier in the aftermath of the Civil War, that he befriends and protects the Lakota Sioux, whom he depicts as

15 The 1940 census only recorded 198 Indians in the state of Virginia. Currently, 6 of the 8 tribes of Virginia are unable to obtain federal recognition due to racial erasure under the Racial Integrity (Fiske, 2004).

a noble race on the brink of extinction), Ahmed draws attention criticism of the version in which a white man (played by Kevin Costner) arrives to respect the Sioux, to the point of being able to dance their dances... the man in this example is capable of «converting without converting» (Ahmed, 2000, p. 32) [...] He only transformed by his encounter with the Sioux, while they remain relegated to being the mechanism of his transformation. He becomes the authentic knower, while they remain as what there is by meet and consume, and spit again, like good savages confirming white man's position as the hero of history [...] the Sioux remain as objects, while Kevin Costner is able to go where he wants and be he wants to be. (Ahmed's analysis, as discussed by Razack, 2007, p. 379) For the purposes of this article, we place the desire to convert without becoming [Indigenous]

in the settler's adoption fantasies. Such fantasies may involve adoption of Indigenous practices and knowledge, but more than that, they refer to those narratives in the colonial imagination of the settlement, in which the native (with the understanding that he is on the verge of extinction) give up his land, claim him for the land, the indigenism of himself to the settler to protect them. this is a fantasy invested in a settler's future, subjected to the embargo of an Indigenous future. Settler adoption fantasies are long-standing narratives in the United States. United States, fostered by rare instances of ceremonial "adoptions," from the adoption of John Smith in 1607 by Powhatan (Pocahontas's father), until the adoption of Lewis Henry Morgan in 1847 by the member of the Seneca Jimmy Johnson, until the recent adoption of actor Johnny Depp in the family by LaDonna Harris, Comanche woman and social activist. Like the nations sovereign, tribes make decisions about who is considered a member, so our interest is not in whether the adoptions are appropriate or legitimate. Plus well, because that of narrative in literature, film, television, American holidays and history books far exceeds the cases of real adoptions, we are interested in how this narrative weaves a fantasy that a settler individual can become innocent, either heroic or indigeneized, against an undercurrent of national guilt. The fantasy of adoption is the ace up the sleeve wanted by critical settlers who feel remorse for the colonialism of settlement, one that absolves them of the legacy of the settlers' crimes and that conveys a new legacy of aboriginality and land claims (which is a reaffirmation of what has always been the project of the settler). To explain it in all its dimensions, we turn to what may be the version most influential narrative of adoption, written by James Fenimore Cooper in 1823-1841. James Fenimore, son of "that genius of speculation on the land that was William Cooper» (Butterfield, 1954, p. 374), grew up in the territory of the Six Nations that his father had appropriated and named after him. his name as Cooperstown, New York. In those lakes, forests and hills Iroquois, James Fenimore, and later his daughter, Susan, imagined for themselves Old West romances full of tragic Indigenous, resourceful and compassionate settlers and virginal white and Indigenous women in the middle of virgin nature.

Cooper's five-book series, collectively called the Stories of the leather stockings (Leatherstocking Tales), are foundational in the appearance of American literature. Melville called Cooper "our national author." and it was not an exaggeration. His were the most widely read novels at the time, and in the printing age, that meant they were the ledgers circulation in a popular culture based on books printed in the United States. Mass printing established a national language and identity, an "imagined community" (Anderson, 1991) from which "America" emerges as a nation, as opposed to a simple selection of former colonies. At the same time, the indigenous about to disappear, the ingenious pioneer and the black degenerate: the fundamental triad of archetypes that forms the basis of an American national literature.

The Last of the Mohicans is undoubtedly the most famous of the Stories and has been reproduced in three different television series, in 1957, 1971 and 2004; an opera in 1977; a radio adaptation on the BBC in 1995; a series of comics in 1995; a theatrical drama on stage since 2010; and eleven different movies in a period that extends from 1912 to 1992. In a sense, The Last of the Mohicans is a national narrative that has never stopped being played.¹⁷

In all five books, Cooper's epic hero is Natty Bumppo, a white man "who made native", in his house in the middle of nature, praised for his wisdom and his customs, both indigenous and white. In The Last of the Mohicans, this hero becomes adoptive son of Chingachgook, fictional chief of the fictional tribe of the "Mohicans", who adopts the name of Natty, Nathaniel Hawkeye (Ojo de Halcón), with which he legitimizes and completes his indigenism. Alongside, Chingachgook conveniently fades to extinction. In a critical symbolic gesture, Chingachgook gives up his son Uncas –the last of the Mohicans– to the white adopted and indigenized, Hawkeye. When Uncas died, the repercussion is obvious: Hawkeye becomes without becoming the last of the Mohicans. Now you are one of us, now you are native. The pale-faces are masters of the land and the time of the redskins has not returned yet» (Cooper, 2000, p. 407).

¹⁶ Tellingly, these remakes were produced in Canada, Great Britain, Germany, and the United States.

¹⁷ To include all "reproductions" of history in its different forms (for example, fictional

historical post-9/11 Gangs of New York, the 2009 movie Avatar, or the movie The Descendants 2011, also discussed in this article), would require a comprehensive account well beyond the scope of this article.

Cooper's books fantasize about the founding and expansion of the nation colonizing American novelizing the period from 1740 to 1804, synthesizing it in the narrative of a single man. The journey of his life represents the narrative of national development: the heroic settler Natty Bumppo goes from being a trapper British to a "native" American, to a pioneer of the prairies in the new western border. The interesting thing is that the books themselves were written in reverse chronological order, starting with the pioneer and going back in the weather. Through this historical hypnosis, the colonist's literature fabricates lives past, always back to an Indigenous past. "I am American" becomes in "I am a colonizer, I was British, I was indigenous".

In this fantasy, Hawkeye is both an adopter and an adopted. The act of adopting Indigenous customs makes it "worthy" of being adopted by the Natives. The settlers' adoption fantasies mitigate the anxiety of not settler's property. He embraces love for the land and therefore thinks that he belongs to the earth. He first he is an environmentalist and sentimentalist, full of nostalgia for the disappearance of native customs. In today's parlance, he could be considered an environmental activist and supporter of the Indigenous. The same time, his cultural hybridity is what makes him more "fit" for survival –ultimate social Darwinism– better than the British and the Indigenous; He is he American myth. Hawkeye, a hybrid of white and Indigenous, becomes in the reluctant but legitimate heir to the land and guardian of the people from him in via of disappearance.

Similarly, the settler intellectual who hybridizes decolonial thought with Western critical traditions (metaphorizing decolonization), stands as superior to Native intellectuals and continental theorists alike.

With his critical hawk eye, he again sees the criticism better than anyone else and sees the world from a more idealistic place.¹⁸ It is a fiction, just like Hawk's Eye of Cooper, as well as adoption and as belonging.

In addition to forging historical memory, Stories serve to generate amnesia

historical. The books were published between 1823-1841, at the height of the period Jacksonian with the Forced Removal of Indians Act of 1830 and the subsequent Trail of Tears from 1831 to 1837. During that period, he was expelled from his places of origin to 46,000 Native Americans, and opened 25 million acres of land for recolonization. The Stories not only silence the Forced Retirement of the Indigenous, but they relate the Indigenous as if it disappeared in a period of time previous, so that the Indians were already dead before the expulsion.

18 his regret is that no one else can see what he sees, just as Hawkeye regrets his failed attempts to rescue the whites from the bad Indians, and the good Indians from the ignorant whites. He's the escapee from Plato's cave. The others are trapped in the dark.

Showing sympathy is essential to Cooper's Settler Innocence Project.

It is no coincidence that he is often considered a supporter of the Indigenous (despite the fact that he did not know any) in contrast to the policies of expulsion and genocide of Jackson. Cooper appears as the "innocent" father of American ideology, in contrast to the "bad whites" of history.

Showing suffering is also vital to the settler's innocence project of Cooper. Hawkeye takes on the (imagined) appearance of the native vanishes – brooding, vindictive, protector of a dying life form, that he fails to find a mate and produce offspring. Thus sympathy and suffering are the symbols that are used to absorb the difference of the Other native, coded as pain, the 'not me' in the 'me'.

The colonist's personal suffering fuels his fantasy of reciprocity. The 2011 film, *The Descendants*, is a modern fantasy rehash of the adoption (mixed with a healthy dose of settler nativism). Character by George Clooney, "King" is a haole hypo-descendant of the last princess Hawaiian survivor and reluctant heir to a gigantic piece of land, the last of the wilderness on the island of Kauai. In contrast to his detestable settler cousins, he earns the privilege of him as a lawyer overwhelmed with work in instead of depending on his unearned inheritance. Furthermore, Clooney's character suffers – he is a dysfunctional father, the head of a dysfunctional family, who sees how his wife is fading away in a coma, who realizes she cheated on him– and so he is somewhat Hawaiian at heart. Because pain is the symbol

of oppression, the claims of pain are then equivalent to the claims of being an innocent non-oppressor. By the time the movie is over, King goes against the wishes of the mercantilist cousins settlers of him and chooses to "preserve" the land, reluctantly accepting that he is in charge of the land, a responsibility which was bequeathed to him as an accident of birth. This is the outcome of the reconciliation between the settler-self and the native-not-self internalized in the settler. The Sympathy and supply are deeply satisfying for the settler's cinema: Descendants was nominated for 5 Oscars and won for Best Adaptation. of Screenplay in 2012.

The beauty of this settler fantasy is that it embraces decolonization and abort in a gesture. Hawkeye adopts the Unca, when he dies so convenient. King adopts Hawai'i and denies the need for ea, sovereignty Kanaka Maoli. Decolonization was stillborn, it became irrelevant because the decolonization is already completed with the indigeneized consciousness of the settler. Now well, "we" are all Indigenous, all Hawaiian, and decolonization it is no longer a problem. "Our" only recourse is to move on, even when regretfully, with "our" future settler.

In the unwritten decolonial version of Cooper's story, Hawkeye he would lose his land to the Mohawk, the royal people on whose land he was built Cooperstown and whose rivers, lakes and forests Cooper exploited for his love affairs. border. Hawkeye would fire his last arrow or his last long rifle shot at him, he would return his eagle feather and take up the name of Natty Bumppo, settler on native land. The story would end with the moment of this recognition. Questions remain unanswered: would a conversation follow after that between the Native and the last settler? Would the settler go away or would he just vanish? Would he ask to stay, and if he did, who would say yes? These are questions that will lead to decolonization, and not a priori to appease the anxieties of a settler future.

Moved towards innocence III: colonial mistake

A more subtle move towards innocence is the homogenization of different experiences of oppression such as colonization. Call different groups "colonized" without describing their relationship to settler colonialism is a

equivocation, "the fallacy of using a word in different senses in different stages of reasoning" (Etymonline, 2001). In particular, describe all the fights against imperialism as "decolonizing" creates a convenient ambiguity between decolonization and social justice work especially among people of color, homosexuals, and other groups outnumbered by the settler nation-state. "We are all colonized" may be a true statement, but it is deceptively general and vague, his inference: "None of us are settlers." Mistake, or calling everything by the same name, is a move towards innocence especially fashionable in coalition politics among people of color. People of color who enter or are introduced into the colonial nation-state of Settlement also falls under the triad of settler-native-slave relationships. We refer here to colonial pathways commonly described as "immigration" and how the refugee/immigrant/migrant is invited to be a settler in some scenarios, given the appropriate investments in whiteness, or it becomes in an illegal and criminal presence in other scenarios. ghetto colonialism, prisons and compulsory education without sufficient resources are specializations of settler colonialism in North America; are caused by the collapse of internal, external and settler colonialisms, in new mixed categories.¹⁹ This triad of settler-native-slave and its selective collapsibility seems exclusive of the settler colonial nations. For example, all the Aleut people of the Aleutian Islands was concentrated and taken to internment camps for four years after the bombing from Dutch Harbor; declared logic was the production of the people, but another plausible reason was that the government American feared that the Aleuts would ally with the Japanese and/or it would be difficult distinguish them from possible Japanese spies. The whites who inhabited the islands Aleutians at the same time were not interned. Seclusion in warehouses and abandoned canneries in southeastern Alaska was the cause of a great number of child and elderly deaths, physical injuries and illnesses among the Aleuts. The internment of the Aleuts during the Second World War has been largely ignored by American history. The indigenous stir among Natives, Enslavable Other, and Orientalized Other²⁰ shows how colonialism of settlement builds and collapses its triad of categories.

This colonizing trick explains why certain minorities can sometimes become models and almost assimilable (as exemplified by colonialism of Asian settlement, the rights of Asian settlement, the rights of civilians, the model discourse of minorities and the use of "Hispanic" as a category of ethnicity to designate both white and non-white) but, in times of crisis, returned to the condition of foreign contagions (as exemplified by the seclusion of Japanese, Islamophobia, Chinese exclusion, the red scare, anti-Irish nativism, the antisemitism of the Second World War and the movements against Mexican immigration). This is why "the workforce" or "the workers" as a political class with an agency, it does not activate the decolonizing project. «The moving lines of the international division of labor» (Spivak, 1985, p. 84) cut in two the very category of work in bodies as in the division of castes made for work on the one hand and paid citizen-workers on the other. Part of work becomes a settler, while excessive work becomes a enslavable, criminal, a life that can be taken without penalty.

The impossibility of becoming a white settler in a full way –where in this white case refers to an exception position with the assumption of rights to invulnerability and legal supremacy – as articulated in the literature minority concerned about the status of «glass ceilings» and «foreigner» perpetual" and the "myth of the model minority", offers a strong critique of the myth of the Democratic nation-state. However, its logical extreme, the achievement of equal legal and cultural rights, is actually an investment in the colonialism of settlement. In fact, even the ability to be a minority citizen in the nation of settlers supposes an option to become a brown settler. For many people of color, becoming a subordinate settler is an option even if turning white isn't.

"In pursuit of stolen resources" is an expression that has come across Wayne, and is used to describe overseas Filipino labor (more 10% of the population of the Philippines works outside the country) and other migrations from the colony to the metropolis. That phrase is an important anti-colonial frame of a colonial situation. But an anti-colonial critique is not the same as a

decolonizing framework; anticolonial criticism often celebrates the subjects empowered post-colonials who take denied privileges of the metropolis. This anti-a post-colonial project is not about undoing colonialism, but about rather to remake and subvert it. Searching for stolen resources is confused with settler colonialism, because these resources were first of the nature and the natives, then they were recruited for the service of the occupation and therefore it is almost impossible to reclaim them without reoccupying the Native land. Even, the postcolonial search for resources is fundamentally a model anthropocentric, since the earth, the water, the air, the animals and the plants never they could become post-colonial; remain objects for exploitation by part of the empowered postcolonial subject.

The mistake is the diffuse comparison of colonialisms that erases the scope generalizer of land as the basis of wealth, power, law in nation-states of settlement. Openly manifest a "multicultural" approach to oppressions or remain silent in the face of settler colonialism while there is talk of colonialism, or facing a gesture towards the Indigenous peoples without dealing with sovereignty or Indigenous rights, or promoting a thesis on the decolonization without regard to eviction/employment of the land they are mistakes. That is, they ambiguously avoid committing to the settler colonialism; are ambivalent about minority/people of color / Others colonized as settlers; are cryptic about land rights Indigenous in spaces inhabited by people of color.

Moves towards innocence IV: free your mind and the rest will follow Fanon told us in 1963 that decolonizing the mind is the first step, not the only one. step towards overthrowing colonial regimes. But we wonder if another move of the colonist towards innocence is to focus on decolonizing the mind, or the cultivation of critical awareness, as if it were the only activity of decolonization; allow awareness to replace the more uncomfortable task of giving up to the stolen land. We agree that curricula, literature and pedagogy to help people see settler colonialism, to articulate critiques of settler epistemology, and set aside the histories and values of the settlers to seek the ethic that rejects domination and

exploitation; this is not unimportant work. However, the early concentration on building critical awareness can deflect decolonization, even if the teaching and learning experience of a critical stance against settler colonialism may be so strong that it can feel like you're actually making changes. Until I don't know return the stolen land, critical awareness does not translate into action that alters settler colonialism. So we stand in respectful dissent with George Clinton and Funkadelic (1970) and En Vogue (1992) when they state that if the mind is "freed, the rest (of course) will come in addition."

Paulo Freire, eminent philosopher of pedagogy, educator of the people and theologian of liberation, he wrote his celebrated book, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, in no small part as a response to *The Wretched of the Earth*, by Fanon. Its cannot be overestimated his influence on critical pedagogy and the practices of engaged educators with social justice. Therefore, it is important to highlight significant differences between Freire and Fanon, especially with regard to de/colonization. Freire places the work of liberation in the minds of the oppressed, an abstract category of the worker stripped of humanity in front of an equally abstract category of the oppressor. This is a radical departure from Fanon's work by him, which he always placed the work of liberation in the specificities of colonization, in the categories structural and interpersonal factors specific to the native and the settler. According to the paradigm of Freire, it is not clear who the oppressed are, even more ambiguous is who they are oppressors, and it is inferred throughout the text that there is a third category innocent of enlightened humans: "those who suffer with [the oppressed] and fight their side" (Freire, 2000, p. 42). These words, taken from the initial dedication of *The pedagogy of the oppressed*, appeal to the same fantasy of reciprocity of the settler, based on sympathy and suffering.

Fanon situates decolonization as chaotic, an immoral rupture of a colonial condition that is already predetermined by the violence of the colonizer and it is not resolved in its possible futures. In contrast, Freire situates liberation as redemption, liberation from the oppressor and the oppressed through humanity from him. the humans become "subjects" who can proceed to work on the "objects" of the world (animals, land, water), and certainly read the world (critical consciousness) to

write the world (exploit nature). For Freire, there are no natives or settlers, and even there is no history, and the future is simply a break from the present timeless. Settler colonialism is absent from their discussion, which implies that either it is a category of analysis of minor importance or that it is already a past project completed (a past oppression perhaps). Theories of Freire's liberation echoed emphatically in the allegory of the Cave of Plato, a continental philosophy of mental emancipation, by which the individualistically thinking man emerges from the dark cave of ignorance in the light of critical consciousness.

In contrast, Black feminist thought locates the roots of freedom in darkness of the cave, in that well of feeling and wisdom from which recreate all knowledge.

These places of possibility within ourselves are dark because they are ancient and hidden; have survived and have grown stronger with the dark. In these deep places, each of us keeps an incredible reservoir of creativity and power, of emotion and feeling examined and not registered. The place of power of women within each one of us is neither white nor found on the surface; it is dark, old and deep (Lord, 1984, pp. 36-37)

Audre Lorde's words offer a stark contrast to the image of Plato on liberation as vision-centered: "We white parents They said: I think therefore I am; and the black mothers in each of us—the poet—it whispers to us in dreams: I feel, therefore, I can be free" (p. 38). For Lorde, writing is not action in the world. Instead, poetry is naming to what has no name, "first transformed into language, then into an idea, then into more tangible action» (p. 37). It is important to know that freedom is a possibility that is not mentally generated; it is private and heartfelt.

Freire's philosophies have encouraged educators to use "colonization" as oppression metaphor. In such a paradigm, "internal colonization" is reduced to «mental colonization», which logically leads to the solution of decolonizing the own mind and the rest will follow. That philosophy conveniently circumvents the most disturbing of questions:

The essential thing is to see clearly, to think clearly, that is, dangerously and clearly answer the first innocent question: what is, in essence, the colonization? (Cesaire, 2000, p. 32)

Since colonialism is shaped by global and historical relations, Cesaire's question must be considered globally and historically. Nevertheless, it cannot be reduced to a global response, nor to a historical response. Do That is using colonization metaphorically. "What is colonization?" must respond specifically, with attention to the colonial apparatus that is assembled to order relations between specific peoples and lands, the "natural world" and "civilization." Colonialism is marked by its specializations. In North America and other contexts, settler sovereignty imposes sexuality, legality, race, language, religion, and property in specific ways. Similarly, decolonization must be thought of in these specificities.

To agree on what [decolonization] is not: it is not evangelization nor a philanthropic enterprise nor a desire to roll back the borders of ignorance, disease and tyranny... (Cesaire, 2000, p. 32)

We will deliberately extend Cesaire's previous words to affirm what decolonization is not. It is not turning indigenous politics into a western doctrine of liberation; it is not a philanthropic "auxiliary" process to those at risk and to relieve suffering; is not a generic term for the struggle against the conditions and consequences of oppression. the wide umbrella of social justice may have space for all these initiatives. In contrast, decolonization specifically demands the repatriation of the land and indigenous life. Decolonization is not a metonym for social justice.

We do not seek to discourage those who have dedicated their careers and lives to educating themselves themselves and others to acquire a critical awareness of racism, sexism, homophobia, classism, xenophobia and settler colonialism.

What we ask of them and of you is that you consider how the search for critical conscience, the search for social justice through an illustration criticism, they can also be moved from settlers to innocence – deviations, distractions, that mitigate the feelings of guilt or responsibility of the settler, and conceal the need to relinquish land or power or privilege.

Anna Jacobs's master's thesis, presented in 2009, explores the possibilities of what she calls white harm reduction models. These models treat to minimize the harm or risk of certain specific practices. Jacobs identifies white supremacy as a public health problem that is the cause of most other public health problems. The goal of the models White harm reduction, says Jacobs, is to reduce the harm that white supremacy white has had on whites and the profound damage it has done to non-whites over several generations. From Jacobs's analysis, we understand the curricular-pedagogical project of critical consciousness as a reduction of damage caused by settlers, crucial in reviving practices and life intellectual outside the ontologies of the settlers. The damage reduction (from settlers) is considered only as a temporary resource. As the crisis environment intensifies and communities around the world are exposed to higher concentrations of violence and poverty, the need to reduce the Colonist damage is acute, that deep. At the same time, we remember that, By definition, colonist harm reduction, like awareness, is not the same as decolonization and does not inherently offer any avenue leading to decolonization.

Moved towards innocence V: Peoples marked “at risk” and peoples marked with asterisk

This settler's move toward innocence has to do with the ways in which Indigenous peoples are counted, codified, represented, included/excluded by part of educational researchers and other researchers in the social sciences. Indigenous peoples become visible in mainstream educational research in two main forms: as peoples “at risk” and as peoples marked with asterisk. This comprises a settler's move towards innocence, because it erases and then conceals the suppression of the Indigenous peoples within the Colonial nation-state of settlement and movement of Indigenous peoples as "populations" to the margins of public discourse.

As “at risk” peoples, Indigenous students and families are described as if they were on the brink of extinction, culturally and economically dispossessed, engaged in or about to engage in self-destructive behavior that may

interrupt their education and absorption without interruptions to the economy. Still when it is widely known that young natives have access to success personal and academic when they also have instruction and access to knowledge in their native languages, to most Native American youth and Alaskans are educated in schools where only English is spoken, by provisional teachers who know little about the communities of their students (Lomawaima and McCarty, 2006; Lee, 2011). Even when the Indigenous knowledge systems predate, expand, update, and complicate, the curricula found in most establishments public educational institutions attended by low-income Indigenous students are among the most highly regulated in an attempt to meet mandates federal. Although such mandates violate the sovereignty of Indigenous peoples, the "services" promised at the origin of such mandates do little to those establishments attended by Indigenous youth offer a better educational, exciting, relevant, inspiring and meaningful.

At the same time, the Indigenous communities become the peoples marked with an asterisk, which means that they are represented by a asterisk on large and crucial data sets, much of which is done to configure a public policy that impacts our/their lives (Villegas, 2012). There are no statistics on health and education of the Indigenous communities for various reasons and, when there are, the size of n, or sample size, may appear insignificant compared to the sample size of other categories or racial categories. While Indigenous scholars like Malia Villegas recognize that Indigenous peoples are different from each other, and also of other racialized groups that are the object of survey in these studies, state that the difficulty of collecting basic information on health and education in this small and heterogeneous category if you want to counter the disappearance of indigenous particularities in public policy.

Particularly in educational research in the United States, only Indigenous peoples as asterisks, or footnotes in dominant paradigms educational inequality in the United States. This can be seen in the progressive literature on school discipline, in "unrepresented minorities"

in higher education and in the literature of repair, that is, that it corrects "past" injustices against nonwhite Others. According to these paradigms, do valuable work to mitigate the symptoms of colonialism (poverty, dispossession, criminality, premature death, cultural genocide), indigenism is simply an "and" or an illustration of oppression. "Urban education" example, is a code word for the education of young Black, brown and confined to ghettos, who constitute the numerical majority in public schools no investment. Urban American Indians and Native Alaskans they become an asterisk group, invisible, even when about two thirds portions of Indigenous peoples in the United States live in urban areas, according to the 2010 census. But Urban Indians receive fewer federal resources for education, health, and employment than their reserve counterparts (Berry, 2012). In the same way, the Nativo Pasifika people become an asterisk in the category of the islander in the Asia Pacific region and its policies/epistemologies/ experiences are often integrated into a pan-ethnic Asian American master narrative. From the point of view of the settler dealing with numerical inequality, for example, the achievement gap, underrepresentation and the low wealth share of the 99% in the metropolis, the asterisk is a separate case, an excess of the number. It is a symbolic gesture, an inclusion and a Enclosure of the Natives in the politics of equity. These acts of inclusion assimilate Indigenous sovereignty, their ways of knowing and their ways of being through a new version of a tribal identity shaped by the collective in an individualized ethnic identity.

From a decolonizing perspective, the asterisk is just a number that it reflects Indigenous politics, educational concerns, and epistemologies. Urban land (indeed, all land) is Native land. The vast majority of Native youth in North America live in urban settings. any initiative of decolonizing urban education must address the foundations of pedagogy in urban lands and Indigenous politics in the face of the settler colonial state.

Moves towards innocence VI: reoccupation and urban colonization

The Occupy movement for many economically marginalized has been a welcome expression of resistance in the face of huge disparities

in the distribution of wealth; for many Indigenous people, Occupy is another reoccupation of settlers in plundered territories. The rhetoric of the movement is based on alleged issues of social justice and is an excellent example of the incommensurability between «re/occupy» and «decolonize» as political agendas. The defense of the rights of workers (and the rights to work) and the rights of minorities in a colonial context of settlement may seem anti-capitalist, but nonetheless that struggle is in largely pro-colonial. That is, the ideal of "wealth redistribution" it camouflages how much of that wealth is land, Native land. At Occupy, appeal is made to "99%" as a deserving supermajority, in contrast to wealth not acquired from the «1%». It leaves Indigenous peoples (a "super minority" of the 0.9%) completely invisible and absorbed, just an asterisk group that will join the legion of occupiers.

Figure 1.1. If America's Land Was Divided Like America's Wealth

For example, "If the American land were divided like the wealth American» (Figure 1.1) is a popular image that circulated on the internet in late 2011 in connection with the Occupy movement. The image reveals inherent assumptions about the land, including: the land is owned; the earth belongs to the United States; land should be distributed democratically. Beliefs that land can be owned by people and that occupation is a right reflect a colonial, anthropocentric, deeply sedimented.

In Figure 1.1, the irony of delimiting wealth in territory seems to escape to most of those who reposted the images on their social media pages and their blogs: the land is already wealth; is already divided, and its distribution is the largest indicator of racial inequality.²¹ In fact, the current crisis of wealth facing

²¹ Wealth, most significantly in the form of home ownership, replaces income as indicator of disparities between racial groups. See the discussions on the wealth gap, the homeownership and racial inequality by Thomas Shapiro (2004) in *The Hidden Cost of Being African American: How Wealth Perpetuates Inequality*.

wealth perpetuates inequality)

99% escalated with the financial crisis of home and land ownership. The

Land (not money) is really the basis of wealth in America. Yes removed the land, there would be little wealth left to redistribute.

Native Lands. 100%. Reserve lands. 23%.

Figure 1.2. If Native land were divided as Native land

Settlement colonization can be understood visually as the rhythm of the invasion and occupation of settlers, in Native lands: the blank space in Figure 1.2. Decolonization, as a process, would repatriate the land to the Indigenous peoples, reversing the chronological advance of these images.

As detailed by intellectuals and public bloggers, such as Tequila Sovereign (the academic Joanne Barker, from the Lenape community), some points of the Occupy movement, including Boston, Denver, Austin and Albuquerque, tried to raise discussions about the problems and colonial nuances of the occupation (Barker, October 9, 2011). Barker writes on her blog about an experience first-hand with the presentation of a proposal for a Memorandum of solidarity with Indigenous peoples,²² to the General Assembly at Occupy Oakland.

The memorandum, signed by Corrina

Gould, (Chochenyo Ohlone, first

Oakland/Ohlone Nations), Barker,

and a good number of other activists and

Indigenous and non-Indigenous scholars called for Oakland to be recognized as land already occupied and on stolen land; the permanent resistance of

Indigenous peoples in the United States and around the world against imperialism, colonialism and oppression; the need for genuine and respectful inclusion of Indigenous peoples in the Occupy movement in Oakland; and the aspiration of "Decolonize Oakland" instead of reoccupying it. From Barker's account of the settler responses to memorandum,

Ultimately, what they [settler participants in Occupy de

Oakland] asked is if we were asking them, as non-Indigenous, what

impossible. Would their solidarity with us require them to give up their lands, their resources, their ways of life, so that we -who after all

we were so few in number – could we have more? could we have it all? (Barker, October 30, 2011)

These responses, resistance on the part of the settler participants to the aspiration of decolonization in Occupy Oakland, illustrate the resignation of some settlers to include the prospect of decolonization beyond the metaphorical or figurative. Furthermore, they reveal the limitations of "solidarity", without the will to recognize the stolen land and how it benefits the settlers. "The Solidarity with Indigenous peoples," continues Barker, "assumes an understanding basic understanding of how histories of colonization and imperialism have produced and continue to produce the legal and economic possibility for Oakland" (Barker, 30 October, 2011, emphasis in the original).

For social justice movements like Occupy to truly aspire to decolonization not metaphorically, they would impoverish, they would not enrich more than 99% of the settler population of the United States. Decolonization removes property rights and sovereignty of the settlers. Demand the abolition of the land as property and ratifies the sovereignty of the land and the Native peoples. There are important parallels between Occupy/Decolonize and revolutions French and Haitian from 1789-1799 and 1791-1804, respectively. haiti holds the dubious distinction of being "the poorest country in the Western Hemisphere" (Central Intelligence Agency, CIA, 2012); but it was the largest French colony France until the Haitian Revolution, the only slave revolution that he founded a state. This paradox can be explained by why/who counts as owned by whom? Under French colonialism, Haiti was worth a fortune in human beings in a slave regime. From the perspectives of French slave owners, Haitian independence abolished slavery, but their property and a source of common wealth. Unfortunately, the history gives us the exact figures of what your property was worth; in 1825, «France recognized Haitian independence by means of a treaty that obliged to Haiti to pay an indemnity of 150 million francs payable in five years to compensate absentee slave owners for their losses" (Schuller, 2007, p. 149). The magnitude²³ of those reparations, not for slavery, but for former slave owners, sank Haiti in eternal debt.²⁴ Occupy follows almost directly from the values of the French Revolution: the Commons, the General Assembly, the

natural right to property and resistance to the decolonization of life and the indigenous land. In 1789, the French Communes declared themselves an Assembly National directly "of the People" (99%) against the representative assembly of "las Haciendas" (the 1%) made up of the elite in power, and adopted the held Declaration of the rights of man and citizen. not far from the heated discussions at the General Assembly on December 4, 2011, of Occupy Oakland who ended up rejecting the proposal to change the name to "Decolonize Oakland," the 1789 National Assembly debated in great detail the terms of emancipation in the Declaration. Finally, the Declaration abolished slavery, but not property, and actually stipulated that property surpassed emancipation. Although he rhetorically stated that men were always free and equal (and therefore not enslavable), guaranteed to the colonial owners (revolutionaries) present in the assembly that his slaves would not be touched, and stated unequivocally: "I feel the right to property is inviolable and sacred, no one may be deprived of she..." (Blackburn, 2006, p. 650).

Table 1.

Disparity of numbers. Immeasurable.

French Revolution 99% French, 1% slaves

Haitian Revolution 90% slaves, 10% whites and free Blacks

Decolonizing the American continent implies the repatriation of all the land and that all settlers lose rights to the land. It is incommensurable with redistribution of Native land and life as autonomous territories.

23.15 billion francs was the equivalent of France's annual budget (and Haiti's population was less than 1% of the French), 10 times the total annual exports in 1825, equivalent to US\$21 billion in US dollars as of 2010. In contrast, France sold Louisiana to the United States. United in 1803 for a net sum of 42 million francs. The demand for compensation, delivered by 12 warships armed with 500 cannons, "foreshadowed a looting strategy" (Schuller, 2007, p. 166), as a new technology in the colonial reconquest.

24 Haiti has literally been in debt from the moment it was recognized as a country. In 1937, Haiti paid its compensation to France, but only through further compensation to the United States. It is ironic that the Paris Club currently has power over Haiti's debt and thus keeps the

Haiti in poverty.

Table 2.

Disparity of numbers. Immeasurable.

Occupy 99% occupants, 1% owners

Decolonize 0.9% Indigenous, 99.1% settlers

Our critique of the Occupation is not just a critique of rhetoric. The call to “occupy everything” has legitimized a series of practices with problematic relationships towards the land and Indigenous sovereignty. Urban occupation, for example, is the practice of establishing residence on urban land in the manner of alleged pioneers on a mythical border. Not surprisingly, urban occupation can also become a way of playing the Indigenous, appealing to indigenism as «tradition» and vindicate spirituality in the Indigenous way, at the same time as it evades indigenous sovereignty and the modern presence of real urban Natives. More significant examples are the claims of the Occupiers for the land and their imposition of western forms of governance within their cities or carp colonies. Reclaim the land for the people and vindicate consensus as the norm of the people, it suppresses the rights of the existing Native land, previous and future, decolonial leadership and forms of self-government. The occupation is a move towards innocence that hides behind the numerical superiority of the settler nation, the elision of democracy with justice, and the logic that what became property under the rule of the 1% rightly belongs to the other 99%.

In contrast to the work of the settler of occupation of communal lands, the colonization and possession, some scholars have begun to consider the task of unemployment in the undercommons, the permanent state on the run and the dispossession as possibilities for a radical Black praxis. That “work that is dedicated to the reproduction of social dispossession as possessing a ethical dimension» (Moten & Harney, 2004, p. 110), includes both the denial of acquire property as to be property.

Incommensurability is controversial

After delving into settler moves towards innocence, we bring a synopsis of the intertwining of settler colonialism with the movements

transnationalist, abolitionist, and critical pedagogy-efforts that are often are considered exempt from Indigenous decolonizing analyses— as a synthesis how decolonization as material, not metaphor, conflicts with innocence of these movements. These are interruptions that destabilize, unbalance and repatriate the very terms and assumptions of some of the more radical efforts for reimagining human power relations. We hold that the opportunities for solidarity lie in what is immeasurable and not in what is common between those efforts.

We offer these perspectives on the conflictivity of innocence, because they are examples of what might be called an ethical of incommensurability, which recognizes what is different, what is sovereign for the decolonization project(s) in relation to social justice projects founded on human rights and social. There are parts of these projects that just can't speak with each other, they cannot align or ally. We make these annotations to put highlight opportunities for what can only ever be collaborations strategic and contingent, and to indicate the reasons why solidarities enduring can be elusive, even undesirable. Next, we point out conflictive issues that question the coalescence of justice initiatives broadly gathered into three areas: transnational decolonizations or from the Third World, abolition and critical pedagogies of space and place. for each one of these areas, we offer entry points into the literature, beginning a kind of bibliography of incommensurability.

third world decolonizations

The anti-colonial turn to the transnational may sometimes mean ignoring the colonial context of the settlement where one resides and how the room is involved in settler colonialism, in order to establish solidarities "global" that apparently suffer less complicity and complications. This is not deliberate viewing is morally convenient, but it avoids an important feature of the already mentioned selective collapsibility of the colonial nation-states of settlement. Expressions such as "the Global South within the Global North" and "the Third World in the First World" ignore the Four Directions by means of a Flat Earth perspective and mix First Nations with migrants

From the third world. For those who write about the decolonizations of the Third World, but those who do it on the Native land, we invite you to consider the permanent settler war as theater of all imperial wars:

- Native American Orientalism (Berger, 2004; Marez, 2007);
- discovery, invasion, occupation and communal lands as claims of the settler's sovereignty (Ford, 2010);
- heteropatriarchy as the imposition of the settler's sexuality (Morgensen, 2011);
- citizenship as forced and coercive assimilation to the settler's regulations white (Bruyneel, 2004; Somerville, 2010);
- religion as an alliance for the nation-state of the settlement (A. J. Barker, 2009; Maldonado-Torres, 2008);
- the border as the first and perpetual site of invasion and war (Byrd, 2011);
- US imperialism as the expansion of US colonialism settlement (ibid);
- Asian settler colonialism (Fujikane, 2012; Fujikane, & Okamura, 2008, Saranillio, 2010a, 2010b);
- the border as the language of «progress» and discovery (Maldonado Torres, 2008);
- rape as a colonial settlement structure (Deer, 2009; 2010);
- the discourse of terrorism as the terror of Native retribution (Tuck & Reece, 2013);
- Native feminisms as incommensurable with other feminisms (Arvin, Tuck, Morrill, 2013; Goeman & Denetdale, 2009).

Abolition

The abolition of slavery often presumes the expansion of settlers who own the land and Native lives through the inclusion of slaves emancipated and prisoners in the settler nation-state. As we have pointed out, it is no accident that the US government promised 40 acres of land Indians as reparations for slavery on plantations. By way of Similarly, European bonded laborers are often they were granted portions of “unsettled” indigenous land as payment upon completion

of their service (McCoy, 2017). Community ownership of land has been central to various movements fighting for autonomous communities, with free determination. "The land belongs to those who work it" he repeats worryingly of John Locke to take Native land as property, "earned" by the very work of clearing and cultivating the "virgin" land. to whom they write about the prison industrial complex, illegality and other forms of slavery, we urge you to consider how slavery is a dual procedure: dispossession of land and creation of property (land and bodies). So the abolition is equally double, insofar as it requires the repatriation of the land and the abolition of property (land and bodies). Abolition means possession of themselves, but non-possession of objects, repatriation, but not reparation:

- "The animals of the world exist for their own reasons. were not made for humans no more than blacks were made for whites or women created for men» (Alice Walker, in the description of Marjorie Spiegel's work, in the preface to Spiegel's 1988 book, *The Dreaded Comparison –The feared comparison–*).
- Enslavement/dispossession of Native Americans (Gallay, 2009).
- Slaves becoming slave owners, savagery as susceptibility to slavery, slavery as a sign of civilization (Gallay, 2009).
- Black maroonage, undercommons and radical dispossession (Moten, 2008; Moten & Harney, 2004; Moten & Harney, 2010)
- Imprisonment as a strategy of land dispossession in colonialism of settlement (Ross, 1998; Watson, 2007)
- Native Land and Native population as co-constituents (Meyer, 2008; Kawagley, 2010)

critical pedagogies

The many critical pedagogies that integrate emancipatory education, place-based education, environmental education, critical multiculturalism and urban education frequently situate land as public commons or they look for points in common between the fights. Although we believe that "we must dominate the language» of the stories and struggles of the other (paraphrasing Alexander, 2002, p. 91), we detect precisely this lack of fluidity in Indigenous sovereignty and, above all,

the earth. Yupiaq scholar Oscar Kawagley's statement, "We know that the Mother Nature has a culture, and it is a native culture» (2010, p. xiii), we leads us to think of the earth as something "more than a place where humans do history or a site that accumulates history» (Goeman, 2008, p. 24). the special edition in preparation in Environmental Education Research, on Education on the land: Indigenous, postcolonial, and decolonizing perspectives on place and research in environmental education ("Land Education: Indigenous, postcolonial, and decolonizing perspectives on place and environmental education research") would be a good starting point to consider the incommensurability of pedagogies urban environmentalists, based on the place regarding education with the earth.

- The urban as Indigenous (Bang, 2009; Belin, 1999; Friedel, 2011; Goeman, 2008; Intertribal Friendship House & Lobo, 2002)
- Indigenous Land celebrated in history as resistance to the maps of settlement (Goeman, 2008)
- Novels, poetry, and essays by Greg Sarris, Craig Womack, Joy Harjo, Gerald Vizenor
- Remain Indian (Lomawaima & McCarty, 2006)
- Hidden curriculum (Richardson, 2011)
- Red Pedagogy (Grande, 2004)
- Earth education (McCoy, Tuck, McKenzie, 2017_

More about incommensurability

The incommensurability is a recognition that decolonization will require a change in the world order (Fanon, 1963). This does not mean that the peoples Indigenous or Black and Brown peoples adopt positions of domination over the white settlers; The goal is not for everyone to simply trade places on the settler colonial triad, take another spin on the same merry-go-round. The purpose it is to break the implacable structuring of the triad; a break and not a commitment (Memi, 1991).

Breaking the colonial triad of settlement means, bluntly speaking, repatriating land to sovereign Native tribes and nations, abolition of slavery in their current forms and dismantle the imperial metropolis. Decolonization "here" it is intimately connected with anti-imperialism elsewhere. Nevertheless,

decolonial struggles here and there are not parallel, they are not shared equally egalitarian nor do they put a clear end to the concerns of all those involved, in particular not for settlers. Decolonization is not ambiguous with respect to other anti-colonial struggles. It is immeasurable.

There is so much that is immeasurable, so many overlaps that cannot be imagined, that they cannot be resolved. Settler colonialism feeds imperialism everywhere

The balloon. Oil is the engine and the reason for the war, as was salt and will be water.

The settler's sovereignty over these pieces of land, air and water is what makes possible these imperialisms. The same yellow pollen in the water of the Laguna Pueblo reserve in New Mexico, Leslie Marmon Silko reminds us, is the same uranium that annihilated to more than 200,000 strangers in 2 flashes. The same yellow pollen that poisons the land where it came from. Worn in the same war that took a generation of young Village. Through the voice of his character Betonie, Silko writes, "Thirty thousand years ago they were not strangers. You could see what the evil had done; witchcraft was seen spreading to all the width of the world" (Silko, 1982, p. 174). In Tucson, Arizona, where Silko lives, his books are now banned from schools. Only curricular materials can be taught that affirm the innocence of the colonist, his ingenuity and his right to America.

In "No," his response to the US invasion of Iraq in 2003, the poet Mvskoke / Creek Joy Harjo (2004) writes, "Yes, that was me you saw trembling with courage, at the back the rifle that the government gave me as an endowment. I'm sorry I couldn't greet you, as you deserved, my relative."25 Don't Native Americans participate in larger proportions in the army? asks the young man from Viet Nam.

"Indigenous country" was the term used by the US military in Viet Nam, Afghanistan, Iraq for "enemy territory." The first African-American president he uttered without batting an eyelid, "There was a time before the people left, when we had everyone back in the helicopter, in which they said that Geronimo was killed and Geronimo was the code name for bin Laden." Elmer Pratt, leader of the Panthers Negras, unjustly imprisoned for 27 years, was a Vietnam veteran, and they put him the nickname "Geronimo". That's the settlers' nickname for the Apache warrior Bedonkohe, who fought against the Mexicans and later against the American expansion in the lands Apache tribal. The Colt .45 was perfected to kill Indians during the "liberation" of what became the Philippines, but was originally invented for the

"Indian Wars" in North America along with the Hotchkiss cannon, a machine gun who fired cannonballs. The technologies of permanent settler warfare repurposed for foreign wars, including boarding schools, colonial schools, urban schools run by military personnel.

The name of Indigenous Country is correct.

Figure 1.3. Hotchkiss machine gun

The ideologies American settler colonialism shaped directly Australian settler colonialism. The areas reserved for Black people of apartheid South Africa, the death zones in what became the colony, later the nation-state, Filipino, the chessboard of the earth with border controls, were modeled after land embargoes and concentrations of Indian bodies on reservations. Racial Science Developed in the United States (a settler colonial racial science) shaped the Hitler's designs on racial purity ("This book is my bible," he said of *The Passing of the Great Race* by Madison Grant). The admiration is sometimes mutual, doctors and administrators of forced sterilizations of Black, Indigenous people, with disabilities, poor and mostly women –The Sterilization Law accompanied the Racial Integrity Act and the Pocahontas Waiver – praised the Nazi eugenics. Forced sterilizations were made illegal in California in 1964. The Management Technologies of North American Settlement Colonialism they have provided the instruments for internal colonialism in other countries. The same thing happened with state philosophies and land grabs by corporations.²⁶ The importance of "flat world" prospects reaffirms that technology has had the luxury of reducing the importance of place and borders. I know argues that US borders have become more flexible, but at the same time, the physical border has been reinforced and more absolute. The border ceased to be just a line that sutures two nation-states; state The United States now monitors the internal borders of its territory and exercises sovereignty throughout the balloon. Just as sovereignty has expanded, so has colonialism. settlement in partial forms.

The lower 9th electoral district of New Orleans is located at the confluence of the river channels and the waters of the gulf and at the intersection of the grabbing of land and human servitude. The collapse of the levies heralded the collapsibility selection of the native slave, again, for the purpose of reinvasion, recolonization, reoccupation. The naturalized disaster of the floods caused by Hurricane Katrina were the ideal pretext for speculation on the land and the screening of the excess of inhabitants. What cannot be absorbed cannot be incorporated (since the settlers will not give up THEIR lands to promote abolition), translates into a pile of bodies one on top of another in social housing and prisons, in cells, far from the market employment, doing work for others (guards and other corrections staff) who they earn money for the occupation of human-states. You need to fabricate crime to higher rates than anywhere else in the world. One of six inhabitants in the state of Louisiana are deprived of their liberty, the largest number of inhabitants in cages per capita, making the state America's prison capital and therefore in the prison capital of the world.

Table 3.

prison capital of the world

Prisoners per 100,000 inhabitants

Louisiana 1,619

United States 730

Russia 450

Iran 333

Chinese 122

Afghanistan 62

Source: Chang (2012), The Times-Picayune.

The flood plains of the delta of the Yazoo and Mississippi rivers were once land so fertile that it could be squeezed into excess cotton, which it gave rise to plantation slavery on an exceptionally large scale. Plantation owners lived in houses like pyramids and slavery there assumed an extreme form, even for the South, beginning with the slavery of the Chitimachas, Choctaw, Natchez, Chacöachas, Natchez, Westo, Yamasee, Euchee, Yazoo and Tawasa, and later replaced by the slaves of

West Africa. They literally worked until they dropped dead. This "place more to the south of the earth" (Cobb, 1992) was a place of total terror for Blacks even being slaves (the worst place to be sold too, the place of no return, the place of premature death). Black and Native peoples alike were induced to raid and enslave aboriginal tribes, in exchange for their freedom or to extend their own susceptibility to slavery by British, French and then Americans. Abolition has its incommensurabilities.

The Delta is now more segregated than it was under Jim Crow in the 1950s. (Aiken, 1990). The growing number of all Black populations, in poverty, is the result of the mechanization of agriculture and an alliance of the settler who keeps Black people landless. When the hand of Black work has no work, the underlying Black person is excess.

Angola Farm is perhaps the more notorious of the two state penitentiaries along the Mississippi River. Three hundred miles upriver in the upper Delta region is Parchment Farm. Both penitentiaries (Mississippi and Louisiana, respectively), both former slave plantations, both converted to loan farms of convicts for forced labor almost immediately after the Civil War by genial land speculators allied with prison wardens. After that the triumph of the Union in the Civil War "abolished" slavery, the former mayor confederate Samuel Lawrence James obtained the loan for the penitentiary from the state of Louisiana in 1869, and then purchased Angola Farm in 1880 as land for put his slaves to work.

Cages on wheels. To mobilize labor on land by people landless whose crime was to travel on land that was not theirs. The biggest trafficker people of the world is the prison state within the United States, not some triad secret thai or russian mafia or chinese drug dealer. The American prison state it is justly called neo-slavery, precisely because it is legal. It's not just a product of exceptional racism in America, its racism is a direct function of the colonial mandate of settlement of land and people as property. The Black Codes declared it illegal to wander, that is, the lack of land, in the pre-Civil War South, which made it a crime to Black body that possessed itself, but was dispossessed (a similar logic made

possible capture, imprisonment and forced servitude of any Indigenous by anyone in California until 1937, based on the ideology that Indigenous people are both landless and land-like). Dennis

Childs writes 'the slave ship and plantation', not Bentham's panopticon, as Foucault put it, "operated as spatial, racial, and economic templates for later models of coerced labor and human storage, like the original United States prison industrial complex" (2009, p. 288). geopolitics and biopolitics are fully intertwined in a colonial context of settlement.

Despite the rise of stock-traded prisons, farms are not essentially capitalist associations; at their core, they are institutions of colonial contract, very similar to the Spanish Missions, Indian boarding schools and school systems of the ghettos.²⁷ The task of caging Black bodies is paid for by the State and then bestows the land, worked by hand of convict work, to generate profits additional for the owners of the prisons. However, it is the management of the presence of excess in the land, not forced labor, the main object of slavery in settler colonialism.

Today, 85% of prisoners in Angola die there.

conclusion

An ethic of incommensurability, which guides the moves that disturb the innocence, stands in contrast to the purposes of reconciliation that motivate settlers' moves toward innocence. Reconciliation has to do with the rescue of the settler's normality, with the rescue of a future for the colonist. Reconciliation has to do with the questions of what will the decolonization?; what will happen after the abolition?; what will be the consequences of decolonization for the settler? Incommensurability recognizes that these questions do not have to be answered and may not be able to be answered so that there is decolonization as a framework.

We want to say, first of all, that decolonization is not bound to answer those questions; decolonization does not have to answer to the settlers or before the future of the settlers. Decolonization has to answer

for Indigenous sovereignty and future. However, we recognize the questions from the wary participants in Occupy Oakland and other settlers who want know what decolonization will demand of them. The answers are not completely obvious and cannot be so while decolonization remains marked by the metaphor. The answers will not spring from a friendly understanding, and in fact will require a risky understanding of the lack of common ground that prevents the union of policies in coalition, movements that may seem very little friendly. But we will discover the answers when we get there, "to the exact extent in which we can discern the movements that give historical form and content to [decolonization]" (Fanon, 1963, p. 36).

Totally sanctioning an ethic of incommensurability means renouncing future of the settler, to abandon the hope that the settlers may one day be commensurate with the Native peoples. It means remove the asterisks, dots, commas and apostrophes, whiles, buts, and conditional clauses that mark decolonization and ensure the innocence of the settler. futures Natives, the lives that will be lived when the settler nation is gone, those are the unwritten possibilities that an ethics of incommensurability makes possible. when the punctuation is removed what he says about raised lines of documents on lands occupied by the army its extension and location its definitive character is removed and opens the possibility of other futures Craig Santos Pérez, Chamoru intellectual and poet (according to Franciszka Voeltz, 2012)²⁸

Decolonization offers a different perspective on the prospects for justice based on human rights and civilians, a disturbing prospect, more that complementary. decolonization it is not an "and". It is an "elsewhere".

